## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

IN RE: PARAGARD PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION	: MDL DOCKET NO. 2974 :
This document relates to: CATHY L. HAYES	: 1:20-md-02974-LMM :
vs.	: Civil Action No
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., ET AL.	; ; ;
SHORT I	FORM COMPLAINT
Come(s) now the Plaintiff(s) nan	ned below, and for her/their Complaint against the
Defendant(s) named below, incorporate(s)	the Second Amended Master Personal Injury Complaint
(Doc No. 79), in MDL No. 2974 by referen	ce. Plaintiff(s) further plead(s) as follows:
1. Name of Plaintiff placed wit	h Paragard: <u>CATHY L. HAYES</u>
2. Name of Plaintiff's Spouse (	if a party to the case): N/A
3. If case is brought in a repres	entative capacity, Name of Other Plaintiff and capacity
(i.e., administrator, executor,	, guardian, conservator): <u>N/A</u>
4. State of Residence of each P	laintiff (including any Plaintiff in a representative
capacity) at time of filing of	Plaintiff's original complaint: <u>CALIFORNIA</u>
5. State of Residence of each P	laintiff at the time of Paragard placement:
CALIFORNIA	
6. State of Residence of each P	laintiff at the time of Paragard removal: <u>CALIFORNIA</u>

- 7. District Court and Division in which personal jurisdiction and venue would be proper:

  <u>UNITED STATES COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA</u>

  <u>WESTERN DISTRICT</u>
- 8. Defendants. (Check one or more of the following five (5) defendants against whom Plaintiff's Complaint is made. The following five (5) Defendants are the only Defendants against whom a Short Form Complaint may be filed. No other entity may be added as a Defendant in a Short Form Complaint.):
- ☐ A. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.
- 図 B. Teva Women's Health, LLC
- ☐ C. Teva Branded Pharmaceutical Products R&D, Inc.
- ☑ D. The Cooper Companies, Inc.
- ⊠ E. CooperSurgical, Inc.
- 9. Basis of Jurisdiction
- Diversity of Citizenship (28 U.S.C. § 1332(a))
- ☐ Other (if Other, identify below)

10.

Date(s) Plaintiff	Placing Physicians(s) or other	Date Plaintiff's	Removal Physician(s)
had Paragard	Health Care Provider	Paragard was	or other Health Care
placed	(include City and State)	Removed	Provided (include
(DD/MM/YYYY)		(DD/MM/YYYY)	City and State)**
		*	**If multiple
		*If multiple	removal(s) or
		removals or	attempted removal
		attempted removal	procedures, list
		procedures, list	information
		date of each	separately.
		separately.	

E /E /OO4.4	D D 1 6 11	0/04/0004	D 0 : B:		
5/5/2014	Dr. Douglas Smith Long Beach, CA	9/24/2021	Dr. Optum Primary Care		
	Long Beach, CA		Long Beach, CA		
			8 ,		
		12/3/2021	Dr. Douglas Smith		
			Long Beach, CA		
11.	Plaintiff alleges breakage (other tha	n thread or string bre	eakage) of her Paragard upon		
	removal.				
$\boxtimes$	Yes				
	No				
4.0					
12.	Brief statement of injury(ies) Plaint	iff is claiming:			
	As a direct and proximate result	of Defendants' con	duct, Plaintiff suffered and		
	continues to suffer significant bodi	ly and mental injuries	, including but not limited to		
	pain and suffering, mental anguish, disfigurement, embarrassment, inconvenience, los				
	of earnings, loss of reproductive health and past and potential future medical expenses.				
	or earnings, ross or reproductive new	and past and pote	ratar ratare mearcar expenses.		
	Plaintiff reserves her right to allege	e additional injuries a	nd complications specific to		
	her.				
13.	Product Identification:				
	a. Lot Number of Paragard pl	aced in Plaintiff (if no	ow known): <u>Unknown</u>		
	b. Did you obtain your Paraga	.rd from anyone other	r than the Healthcare		
	Provider who placed your F	Paragard:			
	□ Yes ⊠ No				
14.		Quoht by Plaintiff(s).			
1 1.	Counts in the Master Complaint brought by Plaintiff(s):				
$\boxtimes$	Count I – Strict Liability / Design Defect				

Count II – Strict Liability / Failure to Warn

 $\boxtimes$ 

$\boxtimes$	Count III – Strict Liability / Manufacturing Defect			
$\boxtimes$	Count IV – Negligence			
$\boxtimes$	Count V – Negligence / Design and Manufacturing Defect			
$\boxtimes$	Count VI – Negligence / Failure to Warn			
$\boxtimes$	Count VII – Negligent Misrepresentation			
$\boxtimes$	Count VIII – Breach of Express Warranty			
$\boxtimes$	Count IX – Breach of Implied Warranty			
$\boxtimes$	Count X – Violation of Consumer Protection Laws			
$\boxtimes$	Count XI – Gross Negligence			
$\boxtimes$	Count XII – Unjust Enrichment			
$\boxtimes$	Count XIII – Punitive Damages			
	Count XIV – Loss of Consortium			
	Other Count(s) (Please state factual and legal basis for other claims not included in			
the Ma	ster Complaint below):			
15.	"Tolling/Fraudulent Concealment" allegations:			
	a. Is Plaintiff alleging "Tolling/Fraudulent Concealment"?			
	⊠ Yes			
	□ No			

b. If Plaintiff is alleging "tolling/fraudulent concealment" beyond the facts alleged in the Master Complaint, please state the facts and legal basis applicable to the Plaintiff in support of those allegations below:

Prior to having the ParaGard IUD implanted, Plaintiff's healthcare providers told her ParaGard IUD was safe, effective, non-hormonal, do and have string checks, needed to be removed in 10 years, easily removed and that she could get pregnant immediately after removal because the IUD. She did not realize that she might have a cause of action regarding the ParaGard IUD. She did not know there was an issue with the ParaGard IUD. She contacted her lawyers after learning she might have a claim.

16.	Count VII	(Fraud & Deceit)	and County	y VIII (	Fraud by	y Omission)	allegations
-----	-----------	------------------	------------	----------	----------	-------------	-------------

a.	Is Plaintiff bringing a claim under Count VII (Fraud & Deceit), Count VIII
	(Fraud by Omission), and/or any other claim for fraud or misrepresentation:

$\boxtimes$	Yes
	NΙο

- b. If Yes, the following information must be provided (in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and/or 9, and/or with pleading requirements applicable to Plaintiff's state law claims):
  - i. The alleged statement(s) of material fact that Plaintiff alleges was false:

    Paragard, a reversible form of birth control, was safe and effective.

    Paragard was safe and/or safer than other reversible birth control products on the market.
  - ii. Who allegedly made the statement: <u>Defendants</u>

	iii. To whom the statement was allegedly made: Plaintiff and her
	healthcare provider who implanted Paragard.
	iv. The date(s) on which the statement was made: <u>Defendants' statements</u>
	are within the Paragard label and marketing materials at all relevant
	times prior to implantation.
17.	If Plaintiff is bringing any claim for manufacturing defect and alleging facts beyond
	those contained in the Master Complaint, the following information must be provided:
	a. What does Plaintiff allege is the manufacturing defect in her Paragard? N/A
18.	Plaintiff's demand for the relief sought if different than what is alleged in the Master
	Complaint: N/A
19.	Jury Demand:
$\boxtimes$	Jury Trial is demanded as to all counts
	Jury Trial is NOT demanded as to any count
	/s/ Laura V. Yaeger Attorney(s) for Plaintiff
Address, phor	ne number, email address and Bar information:

Yaeger Law, PLLC
4905 34th St S, Suite 310
St. Petersburg, FL 33711
727-202-5015
laura@yourlegalcounsel.net
FL Bar # 101972
TX Bar # 24011432